1	CRAIG H. MISSAKIAN (CABN 125202) United States Attorney		
3	MARTHA BOERSCH (CABN 126569) Chief, Criminal Division		
4 5	ABRAHAM FINE (CABN 292647) MOLLY PRIEDEMAN (CABN 302096) LLOYD FARNHAM (CABN 202231) Assistant United States Attorneys		
6			
7	1301 Clay Street, Suite 340S Oakland, California 94612		
8	Telephone: (510) 637-3717 FAX: (510) 637-3724		
9	Abraham.fine@usdoj.gov Molly.priedeman@usdoj.gov Lloyd.farnham@usdoj.gov		
10	Attorneys for United States of America		
11 12	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT		
13	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA		
14	OAKLAND DIVISION		
15	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,	) CASE NO. CR 25-CR-0003-YGR	
16	Plaintiff,	) UNITED STATES' RESPONSE TO DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF	
17	v.	) DEFENDANT'S MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF ) TIME TO FILE VENUE MOTION	
18	SHENG THAO, ANDRE JONES,	) }	
19	DAVID TRUNG DUONG, AND ANDY HUNG DUONG,	) )	
20	Defendants.		
21			
22   23			
24			
25			
26			
27			
28			
	GOV'T RESPONSE TO MOTION FOR EXTENSION CR 25-CR-0003-YGR	I	

At the status conference held on August 14, 2025, the parties agreed to set the matter over for a trial-setting hearing on November 20, 2025. During that status conference, the Court also ordered counsel for Defendant Sheng Thao to file any motion for a change of venue by September 11, 2025, to be heard at the same November 20 hearing. That has now asked the Court for an extension of time to file the motion for a change of venue in a motion filed on August 21, 2025.

When counsel for Thao sought the government's position regarding the extension of time, the government proposed an extension of more than 30 days from the original date set by the Court, and a briefing schedule that would allow for the motion to be heard at the November 20 hearing.

The government's main concern regarding the motion for an extension of time is that it could delay the setting of a trial date and delay the ultimate trial in this case. The government appreciates Defendant's assurances in her motion that "the instant motion is not seeking any delay in the setting of a trial date at the November 20th conference." Dkt. No. 99 at 7; see also Tarver Decl. at ¶ 9. Given Defendant's intent to proceed with setting a trial date at the November 20 hearing, as well as Defendant's assurances that the proposed extension will have no effect on the timing of trial, the government does not take a position on Defendant's extension request and is amenable to the briefing schedule set forth in Defendant's motion.

The government's view regarding the timing of the briefing and hearing on the possible venue motion does not concede that the investigation cited by Thao for the additional time, including polling and surveys by an outside consultant, is relevant, helpful, or necessary for the Court to determine whether a change of venue is required in this case.

21

DATED: August 22, 2025 Respectfully submitted,

United States Attorney

26

ABRAHAM FINE MOLLY K. PRIEDEMAN LLOYD FARNHAM

CRAIG H. MISSAKIAN

 $/_{\rm S}/$ 

27

Assistant United States Attorneys

28